

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/759,424 | 01/12/2001 | Manabu Sawasaki | 1508.65123 | 2317 |
| 24978 GREER, BURI | 7590 11/03/200 NS & CRAIN | EXAMINER | | |
| 300 S WACKE | | | NGUYEN, DUNG T | |
| 25TH FLOOR CHICAGO, IL | 60606 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2871 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 11/03/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | 09/759,424 | SAWASAKI ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Dung Nguyen | 2871 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DV. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v. Failure to reply with the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing eamed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE | N, nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Ju | ılv 2008. | | | | | |
| · · · = · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1.8.23.32-41.54.55.57.59-61.63 and 6 4a) Of the above claim(s) 54 and 55 is/are with 5) Claim(s) 23.32-41.57.59-61.63.65.66-69 is/are 6) Claim(s) 1.8 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | drawn from consideration. allowed. | ation. | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine | | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document: 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents: 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | on No ed in this National Stage | | | | |
| Attack word(c) | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview Summary | (PTO-413) | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | Paper No(s)/Mail Da | | | | | |

Art Unit: 2871

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' amendment dated 07/21/2008 has been received and entered. By the amendment, claims 1, 8, 23, 32-41, 54-55, 57, 59-61, 63 and 65-69 are remain pending in the application, wherein claims 54 and 55 stand withdrawn from consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 1 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lien et
 al., US Patent No. 6,493,050, as stated in the previous final office action dated 01/09/2008.

Regarding claims 1 and 8, Lien et al. figures 1A and 16-17 which disclose a liquid crystal display (LCD) device comprising:

- . a pair of substrates (102, 104);
- . a liquid crystal layer (101);
- . color filters (106);
- . a common electrode (122);
- cell gap adjusting spacers (first spacer 108), wherein the cell gap adjusting spacers (108) covered directly adjacent terminal edges of the color filters (where the color filters 510 and 504 are met) as well as formed over a black matrix(the stacked color filters 112, 510, 504) and the color filters is formed of a substantially uniform thickness as claimed (see figure 16);

Art Unit: 2871

. domain defining projections (pretilt control structure 114/134) as claimed.

. pillar-shaped gap holding spacers (dam 110/602)(see figure 16) formed outside of a display region (see figure 2).

Lien et al., however, do not disclose the gap holding spacers formed interspersedly in an area between outside of the display region and the sealing material region. It would have been an obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to interspersedly form a gap holding spacers since the examiner takes Office Notice of the equivalence of the stripe shaped gap holding spacer and intersperse formed gap holding spacer for their use in the display art and the selection of any of these known equivalents to maintain an uniform cell gap would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 23, 32-41, 57, 59-60, 63 and 65-66 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: none of prior art disclose, singly or combined, an LCD device having a plurality of spacers interposed between two substrates, wherein the spacers are formed to satisfy all condition as set forth in claims 32-33. Furthermore, pixel regions include both first pixel regions, in which a final protection film is interposed between pixel electrodes and a transparent substrate, and second pixel regions, in which the final protection film is not interposed between the pixel electrodes and the transparent substrate as set forth in claims 23, 32-34, 38, 57, 59-60, 63 and 65-66 as well as both the first and second spacers are formed over a black matrix formed on the substrate as set forth in claims 61 and 67-69).

Art Unit: 2871

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 03/12/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's only argument is that Lien et al. color filter material below the spacers is not uniform thickness in an area where a cell gap adjusting spacers cover the directly adjacent terminal edges of the color filters. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's viewpoint since the Lien et al. color filters (e.g., thickness of first color filter 504,thickness of the second color filter 510) do have a substantially uniform thickness as clearly shown in figure 16.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1 and 8 stand.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-2297. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on 571-272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2871

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DN 10/27/2008 /Dung T. Nguyen/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 2871 Application Number

| Application/Control No. | Applicant(s)/Patent under Reexamination | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| 09/759,424 | SAWASAKI ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Dung Nguyen | 2871 | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Part of Paper No. 20081027